

Optimization of Discrete-parameter Multiprocessor Systems using a Novel Ergodic Interpolation Technique

Neha V. Karanjkar and Madhav P. Desai
 Department of Electrical Engineering,
 Indian Institute of Technology Bombay
 email: {nehak, madhav}@ee.iitb.ac.in

Abstract—Modern multi-core systems have a large number of design parameters, most of which are discrete-valued, and this number is likely to keep increasing as chip complexity rises. Further, the accurate evaluation of a potential design choice is computationally expensive because it requires detailed cycle-accurate system simulation. If the discrete parameter space can be embedded into a larger continuous parameter space, then continuous space techniques can, in principle, be applied to the system optimization problem. Such continuous space techniques often scale well with the number of parameters. We propose a novel technique for embedding the discrete parameter space into an extended continuous space so that continuous space techniques can be applied to the embedded problem using cycle accurate simulation for evaluating the objective function. This embedding is implemented using simulation-based ergodic interpolation, which, unlike spatial interpolation, produces the interpolated value within a single simulation run irrespective of the number of parameters. We have implemented this interpolation scheme in a cycle-based system simulator. In a characterization study, we observe that the interpolated performance curves are continuous, piece-wise smooth, and have low statistical error. We use the ergodic interpolation-based approach to solve a large multi-core design optimization problem with 31 design parameters. Our results indicate that continuous space optimization using ergodic interpolation-based embedding can be a viable approach for large multi-core design optimization problems.¹

Index Terms—Design Space Exploration, Discrete Optimization, Multi-core processors

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern multi-core systems have complex architectures, containing multiple components such as cores, caches and interconnects interacting with each other in intricate ways. A system can have tens to hundreds of design parameters, most of which are discrete valued (for example, size and associativity of caches, latency and throughput of components, buffer sizes and issue width of cores), and arriving at a configuration that optimizes cost/performance measures such as execution time or energy consumption under given constraints is a non trivial task. *Design Space Exploration* (DSE) refers to a systematic process for identifying good designs prior to implementation [1]. The set of all possible values that system parameters can take is referred to as the *design space* or *parameter space*. This is a multi-dimensional space

with each dimension corresponding to a design parameter. Cost/performance measures to be optimized over the design space constitute the *objective function*. The optimization process is non-trivial for two reasons:

- 1) Cost/performance measures cannot be expressed as a function of design parameters accurately using simple analytical expressions. Simulation of representative benchmark programs on a cycle-accurate model of the system is typically used to evaluate these measures with reasonable accuracy. Evaluating each design option is thus computationally expensive.
- 2) There are a large number of design parameters. The number of possible design configurations grows exponentially with the number of dimensions.

Techniques for design space exploration aim to find good solutions whilst minimizing the computational expense of finding them. The computational expense for evaluating a single design option is determined by the level of abstraction of the system model chosen. Hardware prototypes or FPGA implementations provide performance measures with high accuracy but involve very long implementation time, while purely analytical models allow faster evaluation but lose out on accuracy. Simulation based evaluation lies between the two extremes. Our work focusses on exploring the design space efficiently, assuming that the objective function is evaluated using cycle-accurate simulations. Existing techniques for exploring the design space can be broadly classified as follows:

- *Exhaustive enumeration*: exhaustive search based methods [2], [3] yield globally optimal solutions but the number of evaluations becomes prohibitive for large number of parameters.
- *Design of experiments (DoE)*: number of evaluations can be reduced by carefully selecting a subset of points in the design space to be evaluated, using design of experiments (DoE) approach [4], [5]. However effectively using DoE approaches other than full-factorial requires prior knowledge about effect of system parameters on performance.
- *Search over discrete parameter space*: randomized search methods such as simulated annealing [6]–[8], evolutionary algorithms [9]–[11] and heuristic-based local search

¹A short version of this paper will be published in the proceedings of IEEE MASCOTS 2015

methods such as hill climbing [12] and Tabu search [13], [14] have been applied to cope with the large dimensionality of the design space.

- *Meta-model based search* : Using systematic sampling, a meta model of the system is constructed. The meta-model may be in the form of an artificial neural network, linear regression model, polynomial or spline interpolation etc. This meta-model is then used in an interleaved manner with simulations to prune the design space or guide search during optimization [15]–[17].

A. Main Contributions

Existing DSE techniques search for the optimum either directly over the discrete parameter space, or search over a meta-model which may be defined over a continuous domain. We investigate a new approach to this optimization problem which is based on *embedding* the discrete parameter space into an extended continuous space, and applying continuous optimization techniques directly over the embedded simulation model for finding local optima efficiently². The main motivation behind this approach is to achieve better scalability with respect to the number of design parameters. Using continuous optimization offers the following advantages:

- 1) Continuous optimization methods can handle large dimensionality of the design space better than exhaustive search or design of experiments-based methods. The number of function evaluations is weakly dependent on the number of parameters.
- 2) They make use of gradient information and are thus more efficient as compared to randomized search methods for finding local minima.
- 3) Continuous space offers more pathways to reach the solution as compared to a discrete space. Continuous optimization techniques can recognize diagonal ridges in the objective function unlike local search methods in discrete space such as hill climbing [1].
- 4) The approach does not involve use of a meta-model, thus each function evaluation is as accurate as the detailed simulation model.

However, descent-based continuous optimization techniques find local minima, and random restarts are required to search for the global optimum. Further, in order to convert the continuous space solution back to discrete space, rounding needs to be employed with care. The idea of applying continuous optimization techniques to solve a discrete optimization problem has been described in the past in chemistry [18] and applied mathematics [19]. To our knowledge this approach has not been investigated for system-level design exploration.

We propose a technique for embedding discrete parameters into a continuous space by using a simulation-based ergodic interpolation method, which, unlike spatial interpolation techniques, can produce the interpolated result within a single

simulation run irrespective of the number of parameters. The basic idea behind ergodic interpolation is to replace each discrete parameter in the cycle-accurate model with a discrete random variable whose value changes over time, such that the set of values of all parameters *averaged over time* within a single simulation run approaches a given point in the extended continuous parameter space at which we wish to evaluate the interpolated performance value. While ergodic interpolation can be applied, in principle, to a variety of discrete parameters, we define and demonstrate the embedding for four types of parameters:

- 1) buffer sizes
- 2) component throughputs
- 3) component latencies (in units of clock cycles)
- 4) number of pipelined stages in interconnect links

(where *component* can be a core, cache, memory module or an interconnect). Our primary motivation was to understand the viability of our techniques for this relatively simple parameter set. Based on our experience with this parameter set (summarized in Section IV), we are investigating the application of the ergodic interpolation technique to other discrete parameters such as cache size and associativity, core issue width etc. We first describe the generic system model used in this study and define the discrete parameters which are subject to embedding in Section II. We then describe the ergodic interpolation technique in detail in Section III.

We characterize the interpolated performance function obtained using our ergodic interpolation technique on a problem instance with 12 parameters. The objective function (total execution time for a parallel workload) is evaluated at closely spaced points along random straight lines passing through the 12-dimensional continuous parameter space. We observe that the interpolated function has low statistical error and is continuous and piece-wise smooth along each line. This indicates that continuous space optimization techniques can be used with this embedding. We present the characterization study in Section III-C.

Next, we apply the ergodic interpolation based approach to find optimal configurations in a large DSE problem with 31 discrete parameters. The parameters are embedded into a continuous space using ergodic interpolation. A variety of continuous space optimization techniques can be applied over this embedding. We choose COBYLA [20], an algorithm that does not require expensive gradient computations. We use an implementation of COBYLA from Python's SciPy library. The objective function to be minimized is a weighted sum of performance and cost components where weights are varied to obtain cost-performance trade-off curves. Performance is defined as the sum of execution times for four NAS benchmark kernels and cost is represented by a synthetic cost function. For each set of weights, we perform multiple optimization runs starting from random initial points in the design space. We find that across all optimization runs (given a limit of 300 function evaluations per run) the solution converges to a local optimum in all cases and the improvement in objective ranges

²Note that this optimization approach is distinct from building an interpolation-based meta model of the system by sampling the discrete parameter space.




Fig. 1. System model

from 1.3X to 12.2X over the initial guess. Further, the spread in objective values at the optimum across multiple runs is low for most cases. We compare the quality of locally optimum solutions found by COBYLA runs with a global optimum reported by an Adaptive Simulated Annealing (ASA) search in discrete space and find that most of the COBYLA runs produce a solution that is close to (within 10% of) the global optimum reported by ASA. The results (presented in Section IV) indicate that continuous space optimization applied over an ergodic interpolation based embedding is a viable approach for solving discrete optimization problems in design space exploration of multi-core systems.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

We use a parametrized cycle accurate model of a multi-core system (shown in Figure 1) that is representative of current NUMA (Non Uniform Memory Access) architectures such as those based on the Intel QPI [21] or AMD HyperTransport [22] standards. The system consists of m processors, with n cores per processor (where m and n are model parameters). The processors are connected to m memory modules, forming a m -way NUMA configuration. Each core implements the Sparc V8 instruction set. Timing of load/store accesses flowing through the memory subsystem is modeled in detail. All other instructions are assumed to execute in one cycle. The cache subsystem comprises per-core split L1 and unified L2 caches and a shared L3 cache. Coherency is maintained using a hierarchical directory-based MESI protocol which is implemented by generalizing the protocol described in [23, Ch. 8.3.2, p.152] to an arbitrary number of levels in memory hierarchy. Interconnect between successive levels in the memory hierarchy is a full-crossbar with parametrized link delays. The NUMA effect is modeled by assigning different delays to links connecting a processor to its local and remote memory nodes. The model is built using the SiTAR modeling framework [24] and is capable of running user-level programs compiled for Sparc V8. Parallel applications can be ported to it using a library of synchronization routines. For all simulations reported in this study, the number of processors (m) and the number of cores per processor (n) were fixed at 2 and 4 respectively.

A. Embedded Parameters

We present a precise definition of the discrete parameters which are subject to embedding. Although we use functional models for all components in the system, each component can be classified into one of three basic types: *modules*, *wires* and *queues*. Modules represent behavioral components in the system such as caches, cores, memory modules and interconnect schedulers, wires represent interconnect links with a parametrizable number of pipelined stages, and queues are used to represent buffering at various places in the system. The system can thus be thought of as being constructed using an interconnection of modules (representing the processor cores for example), wires (which are pipelined) and buffers/queues.

The activity in the system (for example, memory accesses and coherence requests) is modeled by *jobs* and movement of *data-tokens*. A job represents a behavioural action by a module which can consume and produce data-tokens. Data-tokens are used to encapsulate information. Jobs are triggered inside modules by the availability of the necessary data-tokens. The completion of a job may produce new data-tokens that can be transported out of the module. Queues are used to buffer data-tokens. Each module has its own input and output queues for storing data-tokens to be used by or generated from jobs that it executes. All modules, wires and queues in the system are parametrized as follows:

- **queue capacity** $C(q)$: A queue q has a single parameter $C(q)$. In each cycle, the queue q will accept new data-tokens as long as the total number of data-tokens in the queue is $\leq C(q)$.
- **module throughput** $N(m)$: a module m can accept new jobs each cycle as long as the number of jobs being processed by it is $\leq N(m)$.
- **module delay** $D(j, m)$: If j is a job that is accepted by module m , then $D(j, m)$ is the number of cycles it takes for the module to execute the job. The job is removed from the input queue as soon as it is accepted by the module and place is reserved for its output in the output queues. Its output becomes visible in the output queues only after $D(j, m)$ cycles.
- **wire latency** $L(w)$: A wire w has a single parameter $L(w)$ that represents the number of register stages in the wire. A wire can accept at most one data-token each cycle, and each token takes $L(w)$ cycles to pass through the wire. The wire can accept a token only after reserving a place for it in the output queue to which it is connected. The token becomes visible in the output queue after $L(w)$ cycles.

To summarize: our cycle accurate simulation model has the discrete parameters $C(q)$, $N(m)$, $D(j, m)$ and $L(w)$ for all queues q , modules m and wires w that make up the architectural components in the system. We define an embedding for these parameters in the following section.

III. EMBEDDING THE DISCRETE PARAMETER SPACE INTO CONTINUOUS SPACE

An *embedding* of the discrete parameter space into continuous space requires us to extend each discrete parameter to a continuous one. Based on this, we can extend cost/performance functions from the discrete space to the extended continuous space by using interpolation. The embedding should ideally be implemented in such a way that the behaviour of the interpolated cost/performance functions is suitable for the application of continuous optimization algorithms.

Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ be a vector of values of discrete-valued design parameters in the model. $X \in \Omega_D$ where Ω_D is the discrete parameter space. Our cycle based simulation model allows us to evaluate some objective function

$$f : \Omega_D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

The function f needs to be optimized. We construct an extension of f to produce a continuous function $\hat{f}$:

$$\hat{f} : \Omega_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \Omega_D \subset \Omega_C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$$

where Ω_C is a continuous space extension of Ω_D . The extension $\hat{f}$ must satisfy

$$\hat{f}(Y) = \begin{cases} f(Y) & \text{when } Y \in \Omega_D \\ \theta(Y, \Omega_D) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

That is, $\hat{f}$ must be continuous in Ω_C and must agree with f on Ω_D . Thus, we need a suitable *interpolator* $\theta(Y, \Omega_D)$.

Spatial interpolation (performed using standard multivariate interpolation methods such as Lagrange interpolation [25], Simplex interpolation [26] or Monte Carlo interpolation [27, p. 143]) is an obvious candidate for θ . In spatial interpolation, for each $Y \in \Omega_C$, we identify a set of nearest neighbours $X_1(Y), X_2(Y), \dots, X_k(Y)$ of Y such that $X_i(Y) \in \Omega_D$ for each i . Then,

$$\theta(Y, \Omega_D) = I(X_1(Y), X_2(Y), \dots, X_k(Y))$$

where I is some interpolation function. The interpolated value at a single point Y is then computed in terms of the function values of a set of neighbour points, which have to be computed using expensive simulations. Thus, spatial interpolation as a means of embedding is computationally inefficient for simulation-based optimization.

Instead, we introduce an *ergodic interpolation* method which relies on a randomization of the simulation model in order to construct the function θ . Using this, the value $\theta(Y)$ can be produced by a single simulation run. The ergodic interpolation method builds on a sensitivity measurement technique described in [28] for producing small (real-valued) perturbations to discrete-valued parameters in a simulation model.

A. Ergodic Interpolation using a Randomized Simulation Model

The basic idea behind ergodic interpolation is to approximate the result of spatial interpolation with *averaging in time*. Each discrete parameter i in the model is replaced by a discrete random variable whose value changes over time within a single simulation run, such that its *average* value over the simulation run approaches a real number $v_i \in V$, where the set of average values of all parameters $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ represents a point in the extended continuous space at which we wish to evaluate the interpolated performance value.

Several choices exist in implementing such an embedding: for instance, whether the value of the parameter is changed every cycle or once in an interval consisting of multiple cycles, and the exact behavior of a component when it transitions from one set of values for its parameters to another. We present one possible definition of embedding for the $C(q)$, $N(m)$, $D(j, m)$ and $L(w)$ parameters introduced in Section II-A. We observe that this definition leads to interpolated performance functions that are smooth and suitable for continuous space optimization.

In order to construct the ergodic interpolator, we first randomize the cycle-based simulation model introduced in Section II. If $0 \leq p \leq 1$ and if x is a real number, then we define

$$\gamma(p, x) = \begin{cases} \lceil x \rceil & \text{with probability } p \\ \lfloor x \rfloor & \text{with probability } 1 - p \end{cases}$$

Thus, $\gamma(p, x)$ is an integer-valued random variable. If x is an integer, then $\gamma(p, x) = x$. For fixed real x , the expected value of $\gamma(p, x)$ is $p \lceil x \rceil + (1 - p) \lfloor x \rfloor$. It follows that for fixed real x , the expected value of $\gamma(x - \lfloor x \rfloor, x)$ is x .

Suppose the parameters $C(q)$, $D(j, m)$, $N(m)$, $L(w)$ are real numbers. Then the component behaviour in the simulation model is randomized as follows:

- For a queue q with real parameter $C(q)$: Let $p = C(q) - \lfloor C(q) \rfloor$. At every cycle, accept data-tokens into the queue as long as the total number of tokens in the queue is $\leq \gamma(C(q) - \lfloor C(q) \rfloor, C(q))$. For example, if $C(q) = 10.3$, then $p = 0.3$. At each cycle $\gamma(C(q) - \lfloor C(q) \rfloor, C(q))$ will be 11 with probability 0.3 and 10 with probability 0.7, so that during the simulation, the queue will have capacity 10 for 70% of the time and capacity 11 for the remaining 30% of the time.
- For a module with real parameter $N(m)$: At every cycle, start a new job in the module only if the total number of active jobs in the module is less than $\gamma(N(m) - \lfloor N(m) \rfloor, N(m))$.
- For a module m and parameter $D(j, m)$ for some job j : At every cycle, if the job j is started successfully, assign a latency of $\gamma(D(j, m) - \lfloor D(j, m) \rfloor, D(j, m))$ to the job.
- For a wire w with real parameter $L(w)$: At every cycle, for a data-token that enters the wire in this cycle, assign a transport latency of $\gamma(L(w) - \lfloor L(w) \rfloor, L(w))$ to the token.

This randomization effectively ensures that the average value of each parameter can be a real number, while the simulation model continues to be discrete parameter and cycle-based. The net effect is that each parameter in the simulation model can be treated as a discrete valued Bernoulli random variable whose time-average value is the desired continuous value at which the function is to be computed. We call this an ergodic interpolation because the time-average in a single simulation run gives the interpolated value. The rest of the embedding is easy. We embed Ω_D into a box Ω_C as follows: for each parameter p_i in the parameter space, we define a minimum possible value m_i and a maximum possible value M_i . Then

$$\Omega_C = \{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) : m_i \leq x_i \leq M_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$$

For each point $Y \in \Omega_C$, the ergodic interpolation $\theta(Y, \Omega_D)$ for $Y \in \Omega_C$ is produced by the randomized simulation model described above. This technique gives a well defined interpolation. However there are some questions:

- 1) What is the amount of statistical error in the interpolated value?
- 2) Is the interpolation well-behaved? That is, is the interpolated function smooth enough for us to be able to use continuous optimization techniques?

We address these questions in the following subsections.

B. Statistical Error in Ergodic Interpolation

Statistical error in the interpolated value can be controlled by increasing the number of samples of parameter values. This can be done by averaging results from multiple simulation runs, or by using a single long simulation run. For the benchmark programs used as workload in our design exploration experiment (listed in Table I), we estimated the standard deviation of the interpolated performance value at a few points in the design space by generating multiple samples. For these medium sized benchmarks (spanning 8 to 20 million simulated cycles) we find the standard deviation relative to the mean to be between 0.009% to 0.019%. These error values are small, and thus, for long enough benchmarks, a single simulation run is sufficient for obtaining the interpolated performance value at a single point.

C. Well-behavedness of Ergodic Interpolation

We check whether the interpolated performance function is smooth, so that continuous optimization techniques can be applied to it. We do this by evaluating the function at closely-spaced points along random straight lines passing through the extended continuous parameter space. Parameters for this experiment are D , N and C (for output buffers) (as introduced in Section II-A) in L1, L2, L3 caches and main memory. Thus the extended continuous parameter space has 12 dimensions. The interpolated function $\hat{f}$ is the total time to execute a parallel memory test workload. The workload involves each core accessing non-overlapping but interleaved memory locations, and is chosen to stress the memory system sufficiently.

We consider random straight lines passing through the 12-dimensional continuous parameter space. Each line is sampled at 200 uniformly spaced points, and the objective function $\hat{f}$ (total execution time) is evaluated at each of these points using cycle accurate simulations of the model described in Section II. We perform multiple simulation runs at each point with distinct randomization seeds in order to measure the mean and standard error values. In Figure 2, we show the interpolated performance function values (mean $\hat{f}$) evaluated at uniformly spaced points along ten randomly chosen straight lines passing through the continuous parameter space. We observe that along each line, the interpolated function is continuous and piecewise smooth. The measured relative standard error values are less than 0.01%. Thus the interpolated function obtained using our ergodic interpolation technique seems to be well-behaved and suitable for the application of continuous optimization techniques.

IV. RESULTS OF CONTINUOUS OPTIMIZATION USING ERGODIC INTERPOLATION

We apply the ergodic interpolation based approach for finding optimal configurations in a multiprocessor design exploration problem with 31 discrete parameters. The discrete parameters and their ranges are listed in Table II. The parameters are embedded into continuous space using ergodic interpolation over a cycle accurate model described in Section II. Four kernels from the NAS parallel benchmark suite (NPB) [29] are used as workload. We have ported an OpenMP+C version of NPB v2.3 developed by the Omni project [30] to our model. The kernels and their problem sizes are listed in Table I.

TABLE I
NAS KERNELS AND THEIR PROBLEM SIZES

Kernel	Problem Size
Embarrassingly Parallel (EP)	2^{16}
Multigrid (MG)	16^3
3-D FFT PDE solver (FT)	16^3
Integer Sort (IS)	2^{16}

Continuous optimization is performed over the embedding using an implementation of a derivative-free continuous optimization algorithm COBYLA [20] from Python's SciPy library. We define the objective function for this optimization experiment as follows:

A. The Objective Function

Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector of parameter values in the extended continuous space and $\hat{f}(Y)$ denote the objective function we wish to minimize. We construct the objective function as a weighted sum of performance and cost measures. The performance measure $\text{execution\_time}(Y)$ is the sum of execution times for four benchmark kernels (listed in Table I).

We represent cost using a synthetic function $\text{cost}(Y)$ which increases as each parameter is varied in the direction of improving performance. The cost function is defined as




Fig. 2. Interpolated objective function (total execution time) values plotted along ten random straight lines passing through the multi-dimensional continuous parameter space. Each line is sampled at 200 uniformly spaced points.

$\text{cost}(Y) = \sum_i x_i + \sum_j \frac{100}{d_j}$ where d_j and x_i are delay and non-delay parameters normalized to lie in the range $[1, 100]$. This synthetic cost function is sufficient to demonstrate the validity of our technique and can be replaced with other cost functions such as energy consumption as appropriate for a particular design exploration problem. The objective function is:

$$\hat{f}(Y) = \text{execution\_time}(Y) + \alpha \times \text{cost}(Y)$$

Where α is a weighting factor which is varied to obtain cost/performance trade offs.

B. Results

We study the convergence properties of the COBYLA algorithm applied to the objective function obtained by our ergodic interpolation technique. Optimization is performed with multiple values of the weight factor $\alpha \in \{0, 10^4, 10^5, 10^6\}$ to get cost/performance trade-off curves. Further, we perform eight optimization runs starting from distinct randomly chosen points in the parameter space for each value of α . A single optimization run is allowed to make at most 300 function evaluations.

In Figure 3, we show the evolution of the objective function with the number of function evaluations for all optimization

TABLE II
DESIGN PARAMETERS AND THEIR RANGES
(‘OPT’ LISTS PARAMETER VALUES AT THE OPTIMUM FOR $\alpha = 10^5$)

Parameter	Min	Max	Opt	Parameter	Min	Max	Opt
$N(\text{L1I})$	1	4	2.95	$C_{\text{inQ}}(\text{L1I})$	1	4	1.00
$N(\text{L1D})$	1	4	1.93	$C_{\text{inQ}}(\text{L1D})$	1	4	1.06
$N(\text{L2})$	1	4	1.27	$C_{\text{inQ}}(\text{L2})$	1	16	1.12
$N(\text{L3})$	1	4	1.22	$C_{\text{inQ}}(\text{L3})$	1	16	2.22
$N(\text{mem})$	1	4	1.02	$C_{\text{inQ}}(\text{mem})$	1	32	1.00
$D(\text{L1I})$	1	4	1.70	$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{L1I})$	1	4	1.06
$D(\text{L1D})$	1	4	3.17	$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{L1D})$	1	4	1.00
$D(\text{L2})$	8	16	9.33	$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{L2})$	2	16	2.00
$D(\text{L3})$	16	32	21.90	$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{L3})$	4	16	4.00
$D(\text{mem})$	64	128	80.61	$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{mem})$	4	32	4.00
$L(\text{X1})$	1	4	2.18	$C_{\text{inQ}}(\text{X3})$	1	8	1.00
$C_{\text{inQ}}(\text{X1})$	1	4	1.00	$L(\text{X3})$ local	16	64	62.53
$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{X1})$	1	4	1.00	$L(\text{X3})$ remote	32	64	55.27
$L(\text{X2})$	4	8	5.41	$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{X3})$ local	1	16	1.00
$C_{\text{inQ}}(\text{X2})$	1	4	1.00	$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{X3})$ remote	1	16	1.02
$C_{\text{outQ}}(\text{X2})$	1	4	1.02				

- N , D , L and C are parameters as described in Section II-A.
- Components L1I, L1D, L2 and L3 are caches as depicted in Figure 1, mem refers to a main memory bank, and X1, X2, and X3 refer to interconnects between L1 to L2, L2 to L3 and L3 to main memory respectively.
- Links in X3 connecting a processor to its local and remote memory modules have different L and C_{outQ} values to model NUMA effect.

runs. In almost all cases, we observe that the objective function values converge to a local optimum within 200 function evaluations. Further, the spread of values obtained across different initial points is small for most cases as summarized in Table III. Improvements over the initial guess range from 1.3X to 12.2X as listed in Table IV.

TABLE III
OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUES AT THE OPTIMUM ACROSS EIGHT COBYLA RUNS FOR EACH VALUE OF α

	$\alpha = 0$	$\alpha = 10^4$	$\alpha = 10^5$	$\alpha = 10^6$
best	2.916×10^7	3.697×10^7	5.753×10^7	1.218×10^8
worst	2.922×10^7	4.020×10^7	7.401×10^7	2.836×10^8
mean	2.917×10^7	3.836×10^7	6.305×10^7	1.608×10^8
relative std dev	0.08%	3.08%	8.59%	35.66%

TABLE IV
IMPROVEMENTS IN OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE OVER THE INITIAL GUESS

	$\alpha = 0$	$\alpha = 10^4$	$\alpha = 10^5$	$\alpha = 10^6$
best	2.8x	2.5x	3.3x	12.2x
worst	1.4x	1.3x	2.1x	4.4x
mean	1.8x	1.7x	2.8x	8.8x

In Figure 4, we plot cost and performance values at the optimum for each of the optimization runs (as α and initial points are varied). Each point in the plot represents the result




Fig. 3. Objective function values versus number of function evaluations. For each value of the weighting factor α , eight optimization runs are performed starting from distinct initial points.

of a single optimization run with (x,y) coordinates showing (cost, performance) values at the optimum. The plot shows a clear *knee* which can be used to select the optimal system configuration for maximum performance. Parameter values at the best solution among all COBYLA runs (for $\alpha = 10^5$ at the knee) are listed in Table II. The solution indicated in Table II is interesting. For example, it indicates that the throughput parameter N for the L1 I-cache should be approximately 3, while that for the L1 D-cache should be approximately 2. Further, the delay D of the L1 D-cache can be considerably larger than that of the L1 I-cache (3.17 versus 1.70).

Since the COBYLA algorithm produces a local optimum, we are also interested in understanding the quality of the local optimum across random initial starting points. We compare the quality of solutions generated by COBYLA to those generated by an Adaptive Simulated Annealing (ASA) search over discrete parameter space. We use a Python binding [31] of a well-established ASA implementation [32]. In Table V, we show the objective function values obtained after running ASA with a limit of 1000 function evaluations. We observe that most of the COBYLA runs produce solutions that are close to (within 10% of) the global optimum reported by ASA




Fig. 4. Performance and cost values at the optimum for multiple optimization runs (as α and initial points are varied). Each point represents the result of a single optimization run with (x,y) coordinates showing (cost, performance) values at the optimum.

as summarized in Table VI.

TABLE V
OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUES AT THE OPTIMUM REPORTED BY ASA

$\alpha = 0$	$\alpha = 10^4$	$\alpha = 10^5$	$\alpha = 10^6$
2.916×10^7	3.694×10^7	6.063×10^7	1.247×10^8

TABLE VI
NUMBER OF COBYLA RUNS (OUT OF 8) THAT YIELD SOLUTIONS WITHIN 10% OF THE GLOBAL OPTIMUM REPORTED BY ASA

$\alpha = 0$	$\alpha = 10^4$	$\alpha = 10^5$	$\alpha = 10^6$
8	8	6	5

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have described a technique using which discrete parameter multi-core systems can be optimized using continuous space optimization schemes. The technique relies on a novel ergodic interpolation scheme based on randomizing the discrete parameter cycle-accurate simulation model of the multi-core system. The interpolated performance function is continuous, has low statistical error, and was observed to be piece-wise smooth. Using this ergodic interpolation technique, we have applied a standard continuous space optimization algorithm to find optimal designs for a 31-parameter multiprocessor system exercised with a subset of the NAS benchmarks. The optimization algorithm converged to a local optimum within 200 function evaluations and produced substantial improvements ranging from 1.3X to 12.2X over the initial guess in the cases that we have tried. Cost performance curves can also be generated using different weightings of the performance and cost components in the objective function.

More work is needed to completely characterize the impact of rounding on the quality of the results obtained, and on the application of the ergodic interpolation technique to other discrete parameters such as cache size/associativity and processor core issue-width/clock-frequency. However, our preliminary investigations indicate that ergodic interpolation based optimization can be an effective and practical approach for the design space exploration of multi-core systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Part of this work was funded by an IBM Faculty Award. Simulations in Section III-C were run on CDAC's PARAM Yuva II cluster. The authors wish to thank Prof. Virendra Sule for granting us the use of a 48 core cluster and Prof. Sachin Sapatnekar for his suggestions and feedback during initial stages of this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Gries, "Methods for Evaluating and Covering the Design Space during Early Design Development," *Integration, the VLSI journal*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2004.
- [2] T. Givargis, J. Henkel, and F. Vahid, "Interface and Cache Power Exploration for Core-based Embedded System Design," in *1999 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design. Digest of Technical Papers*. IEEE, 1999.
- [3] J. Kin, C. Lee, C. Leez, W. H. M. Smith, and M. Potkonjak, "Power Efficient Mediaprocessors: Design Space Exploration."
- [4] D. Sheldon, F. Vahid, and S. Lonardi, "Soft-core Processor Customization using the Design of Experiments Paradigm," in *2007 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition*. IEEE, 2007.
- [5] J. Yi, D. Lilja, and D. Hawkins, "A Statistically Rigorous Approach for Improving Simulation Methodology," in *The Ninth International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture, 2003. HPCA-9 2003. Proceedings*. IEEE Comput. Soc, 2003.
- [6] H. Orsila, E. Salminen, M. Hannikainen, and T. D. Hamalainen, "Evaluation of Heterogeneous Multiprocessor Architectures by Energy and Performance Optimization," in *2008 International Symposium on System-on-Chip*. IEEE, 2008.
- [7] B. C. Schafer, "Adaptive Simulated Annealer for High Level Synthesis Design Space Exploration," in *2009 International Symposium on VLSI Design, Automation and Test*. IEEE, 2009.
- [8] V. Srinivasan, S. Radhakrishnan, and R. Vemuri, "Hardware Software Partitioning with Integrated Hardware Design Space Exploration," in *Proceedings Design, Automation and Test in Europe*. IEEE Comput. Soc, 1998.
- [9] M. Holzer, B. Knerr, and M. Rupp, "Design Space Exploration with Evolutionary Multi-Objective Optimisation," in *2007 International Symposium on Industrial Embedded Systems*. IEEE, 2007.
- [10] M. Palesi and T. Givargis, "Multi-objective Design Space Exploration using Genetic Algorithms," in *Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium on Hardware/Software Codesign. CODES 2002*. ACM, 2002.
- [11] A. Sengupta, R. Sedaghat, and P. Sarkar, "A multi structure genetic algorithm for integrated design space exploration of scheduling and allocation in high level synthesis for DSP kernels," *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 7, 2012.
- [12] K. Lahiri, A. Raghunathan, and S. Dey, "Efficient Exploration of the SoC Communication Architecture Design Space," in *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer Aided Design. ICCAD - 2000. IEEE/ACM Digest of Technical Papers*. IEEE, 2000.
- [13] P. Eles, Z. Peng, K. Kuchcinski, and A. Doboli, "System Level Hardware/Software Partitioning Based on Simulated Annealing and Tabu Search," *Design Automation for Embedded Systems*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1997.
- [14] T. Wangtong, P. Y. K. Cheung, and W. Luk, "Comparing Three Heuristic Search Methods for Functional Partitioning in Hardware-Software Codesign," *Design Automation for Embedded Systems*, vol. 6, no. 4, Jul. 2002.

- [15] G. Palermo, C. Silvano, and V. Zaccaria, "An Efficient Design Space Exploration Methodology for Multiprocessor SoC Architectures based on Response Surface Methods," in *2008 International Conference on Embedded Computer Systems: Architectures, Modeling, and Simulation*. IEEE, Jul. 2008.
- [16] R. Piscitelli and A. D. Pimentel, "Design Space Pruning through Hybrid Analysis in System-level Design Space Exploration," in *2012 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition*. IEEE, Mar. 2012.
- [17] E. İpek, S. A. McKee, R. Caruana, B. R. de Supinski, and M. Schulz, "Efficiently Exploring Architectural Design Spaces via Predictive Modeling," *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, vol. 34, no. 5, Oct. 2006.
- [18] S. K. Koh, G. Ananthasuresh, and S. Vishveshwara, "A Deterministic Optimization Approach to Protein Sequence Design Using Continuous Models," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 24, no. 2-3, Feb. 2005.
- [19] H. Wang and B. W. Schmeiser, "Discrete Stochastic Optimization using Linear Interpolation," in *2008 Winter Simulation Conference*. IEEE, Dec. 2008.
- [20] M. Powell, "On Trust Region Methods for Unconstrained Minimization without Derivatives," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 97, no. 3, 2003.
- [21] D. Ziaikas, A. Baum, R. A. Maddox, and R. J. Safranek, "Intel Quick-Path Interconnect Architectural Features Supporting Scalable System Architectures," in *2010 18th IEEE Symposium on High Performance Interconnects*. IEEE, 2010.
- [22] C. Keltcher, K. McGrath, A. Ahmed, and P. Conway, "The AMD Opteron Processor for Multiprocessor Servers," *IEEE Micro*, vol. 23, no. 2, Mar. 2003.
- [23] D. Sorin, M. Hill, and D. Wood, *A Primer on Memory Consistency and Cache Coherence*. Morgan and Claypool Publishers, 2011.
- [24] N. V. Karanjkar and M. P. Desai, "SiTAR : Simulation Tool for Architectural Research. Technical report," 2012, unpublished.
- [25] T. Sauer and Y. Xu, "On Multivariate Lagrange Interpolation," *MATH. COMP*, vol. 64, 1994.
- [26] S. Davies, "Multidimensional Triangulation and Interpolation for Reinforcement Learning," 1996.
- [27] J. Hammersley and D. Handscomb, *Monte Carlo Methods*, ser. Methuen's monographs on applied probability and statistics. Methuen, 1964.
- [28] G. Hazari, M. P. Desai, and G. Srinivas, "Bottleneck Identification Techniques Leading to Simplified Performance Models for Efficient Design Space Exploration in VLSI Memory Systems," in *2010 23rd International Conference on VLSI Design*. IEEE, 2010.
- [29] D. H. Bailey, E. Barszcz, J. T. Barton, D. S. Browning, R. L. Carter, L. Dagum, R. A. Fatoohi, P. O. Frederickson, T. A. Lasinski, R. S. Schreiber, H. D. Simon, V. Venkatakrishnan, and S. K. Weeratunga, "The NAS Parallel Benchmarks Summary and Preliminary Results," in *Proceedings of the 1991 ACM/IEEE Conference on Supercomputing*, ser. Supercomputing '91. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1991.
- [30] K. Kusano, S. Satoh, and M. Sato, "Performance Evaluation of the Omni OpenMP Compiler," in *High Performance Computing*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2000, vol. 1940.
- [31] J. Robert. Python bindings for the asa code. [Online]. Available: <https://pypi.python.org/pypi/pyasa/>
- [32] L. Ingber, "Adaptive Simulated Annealing (ASA): Lessons Learned," *Control and Cybernetics*, vol. 25, 1996.